

WUR of October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015... “Embracing Global Goals, Scope and Action: Becoming Global Actors... Claiming the ‘All’” –  
Segue From *Antisystemic Movements...* To Alice (Dft 16)

---

*Today's show:* “Establishing a 'safe' place to plan and express our love: places for the cultivation of soul-sufficiency... which necessarily means: helping each other get 'big' – the process of reclaiming... sharing... and expanding our original 'selves'...”  
(Part 25)

---

[“151004tofillagap.mp3”:]

September 29, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: Is it clear that we cannot 'grow' ourselves unless we're starting with an authentic 'self'? And that recovering our authentic 'self' is key to becoming 'fully developing individualities'?

In *Waking Up* I asked why the martial arts wasn't sufficient for recovering that original person:

[Juan was] right of course... [work' does steal our physical vitality...] But the theft goes beyond that – though, believe me, I'm not making light of the sacrifice of our physical health to the god of profit. [Of course now... with the benefit of Karl Popper's *The Open Society and Its Enemies...* joined with Alice Miller... Martin Bernal... Albert O. Hirschman... Terence K. Hopkins... and John Boswell... I see the sacrifice was given to ten thousand global-state-statesmen...]

But I'd lost track of my whole self before I went into the trades, and that's a question to look at too. When did I lose myself, and how?

And wasn't there a sense in which helping to install the electrical in various buildings helped me reclaim some lost bits? I'd tried before, with martial arts – why wasn't that enough? (from the section “Listening to Our Bodies Is Sacrosanct” in the chapter “The Two Winds” in *Waking Up: Freeing Ourselves From Work*, p. 88)

Back when I was engaged in it I saw my martial arts practice as being about “claiming my body...” after feeling 'disconnected' from it... as being about 'living comfortably in my own skin' after years of feeling 'awkward'... and 'insufficient'. The martial arts... perhaps... would help me over those 'hang-ups'...”

But what did Emily tell us?

To fill a Gap • Insert the Thing that caused it – • Block it up • With Other – and 'twill yawn the more – • You cannot solder an Abyss • With Air

We might modify it to say...: To recover a Theft • Confront the one that took it – • Look for it • With Others – and its loss 'twill ache the more – • You cannot solder an Abyss • With Air

*Waking Up* was about 'doing the analysis' that explains our lack of freedom... so that we could become certain... both about who or what is sitting on us... and how to get out from under it or them. Since writing it I've gained more information that augments the analysis... more confirmation of the strength of it... more certainty about the need to act on it...

We've done the analysis... I think it's accurate... but if you need a double-check... look at who and what they suppress... They kill the folks who owe them no allegiance... who grow their gifts despite... not because of... them... they kill our biggest spirits... who by their very physical existence show... we need no state. We have watched this happen again and again... it's been pointed out to us by numerous ancestors. And we can either choose to stand with them... become ourselves self- and soul-sufficient... choose freedom and happiness for ourselves and our Brothers and Sisters and the planet... or stand with those ten thousand lording it over us... killing whoever they choose without repercussions.

Seven billion on a leash? Is that not obscene?... when we could be free?... when all we have to do is stand with the earth... meet with our Brothers and Sisters... discuss a future without coercion... and get 'big' in the course of it...

'Power' can't offer it as a perk... agents can't stop it.

---

[“151004pursuehappinessasapeople.mp3”:]

'Power' organizes itself as 'power' to pursue its self-creation ('happiness'...) – a hobbled and false 'self-creation'... true... but... in forming themselves into a conscious group they can pursue their collective aggrandizement... which they tell themselves... in violation and contempt of the earth... is 'happiness'. And despite being in our debt for everything they get... they elevate themselves – in their minds – into being the source of it...

This 'self-organization' of 'power' is called “‘the state' and *all* its institutions” – making it a totalitarian system – the key function of which is to prevent us... we-the-people... from similarly organizing to pursue our... authentic – because it honors the ancestors... the earth... and each other... as source – self-creation... simultaneously as individuals and as a people... our authentic happiness.

(On the one hand... we have the codified right here in the U.S. to... *as a people*... pursue happiness... on the other... the state... by definition... disallows our pursuit of happiness because it disallows our formation *into* a people...

...which... arguably... we have a responsibility to do: not only have we been benefiting from the 'excess-suppression' and squeezing of our Sisters and Brothers elsewhere [in non-'core' 'states'...] but simultaneous with that debt we have greater leverage... which we must start utilizing.)

'The state' is an absolutely essential mechanism of management for 'power' – management of our inherent drive to self-creation (happiness...) because 'power' cannot exist if we do not forfeit our earth-given gift of self-development... individual and collective... and yet... the circumstances must be so finessed... that it *seems* we do not forfeit it... else 'power' loses its carefully crafted legitimacy... and their game is up.

So they provide us with 'education'... schools in which to 'grow our gifts'... but only in the directions 'power' tells us are 'appropriate'... 'fit'... make sense... given... 'the system' on which 'education' is premised. Once again we confront the circularity of 'the system'... the inherent totalitarianism.

But it is a dangerous pass for 'power' – when we strive to grow our gifts – and so a dangerous one for us... They make it so... particularly when numbers of us are doing it... in some sense – in some sense of a budding and building consciousness – together. They have amassed weapons and propaganda mechanisms for this moment... this moment when... globally... we would finally get that 'the state' exists to repress... not assist... 'the people' – that is what it was designed for... that is why it exists... and it will fulfill that function no matter what we 'think' about it.

Yet it is only by becoming 'a people' that we can challenge it... and here in the U.S. we have the legal leverage to accomplish this without the state being able to use overt repression against it... for to do so would completely de-legitimate it. But our ability to claim that necessary identity: our organization into 'a people' – necessary in order to check 'power's ruthlessness – has been... as Marcuse said... effectively repressed... requiring an opposite education... new information... new teachers who model what it means to be 'fully-developing' – so that this is a quality of our 'aliveness' that we are not willing to forfeit anymore. And 'the state' is warring on precisely these: on fully-developing individualities... to seek to become which... is the most radical political act under 'class'.

A dangerous pass... but there's no getting around it.

Knowing this... knowing that there is no other way to our freedom... will allow us to stop procrastinating and get on with it... get this 'job' done... we know we must... our survival as human beings who are fully-developing... requires it.

—

[“151004recoveringouroriginalself.mp3”:]

We have stuck with the theme of “outing 'hidden-power'” because it's hard to fight an opponent that you can't see (this obviously has relevance for their use of EMF-weaponry – and their attachment to them – all utilized completely without legal authority [they sure interfere with our right as a people to pursue happiness...] and we have to start talking about it. I say this at times to folks on the street: “They got EMF weapons that can take out ships. What do you think they do to people who

dissent? Can we really accept a world where there is no dissent?... in which we must obey or else be targeted?... with weaponry that we can say nothing about?... be 'punished'? And what would that make us?... effectively 'slaves'...")

...we are the *opposite* of them...: they want to *force* everyone to stay small so they can *seem* big...

...we want to create the conditions so that *everyone* can *be* big – own their own gifts... develop and share them without coercion... so that the beauty we create together will dazzle us... we have faith in our Brothers and Sisters...

'Martial arts' practice is *supposed* to be tied to a larger purpose... beyond individual physical and spiritual development... it is tied to righting wrongs... and the bigger the wrong addressed... the bigger the 'martial artist'. Let's set 'belts' aside and look wide... look at the massive wrong being done to life... to its health and vitality... We cannot pretend this is not the first priority for all of us... when life itself is at risk.

For all of us... what expresses our deepest connection to each other is this first allegiance... to life (there's a key piece of our new education to make sure we pass on to each other and the children: our first allegiance is to life...)

...and in its restoration to health lies our purpose.

We have to seek our place in the story of "life regaining its freedom..."

...we all have a place in it.

Our original... authentic ...'self'... provides the key to our gaining that path...

...so we start there... in recovering it...

...and we seek help from the ancestors... the earth... and each other... in order to do that...

The first step is of course wanting to... wanting to recover our original... true... 'self'...

...but we'll have to assume that at some point... due to some set of 'right' circumstances... each one of us who has experienced that loss will want to recover that of which we were robbed...

We must have faith in our Brothers and Sisters.

---

["151004thechainsaregone.mp3":]

Interestingly... there's a really good illustration of precisely what a 'martial arts' practice ('martial arts' in quotes – I'm arguing that all the arts in this moment are going to have to become 'martial'... that is to say... must engage in this struggle – we are being warred on... and so we all have to step up... and take a stand for our very existence as 'fully-developing humans'...) what a martial arts practice must be to confront global-'power' in the most recent *Slingshot*... our local anarchist newspaper... It sheds light on many of our current themes: having 'faith in our Brothers and Sisters'... incorporating into planning and strategy the new terms of our engagement with 'power' (and by that I mean that we can communicate instantaneously... that we have the Internet... the fact that we can organize a one-day global General Strike almost overnight... when before that would never have been... our Good Three talked about there being... up to now... two 'world revolutions'... well we are at the moment where we can literally organize a 'world *evolution*'... – it is time for us to move on... ten thousand years of 'class' is more than enough... and the moment we have the means to move on we have to... that's our responsibility to life... it is no accident that the earth's ecosystems... its biodiversity... the health of its oceans... our air and water contaminated... This is not by accident... that they want us struggling to actually breathe... that we're looking at famines and hunger and droughts a'plenty... This is called the wages of... not 'greed' but rather... a hubris scaled beyond belief... beyond the comprehension of most of us... So... we all... must... in this moment... become 'martial artists'... and the terms have changed... we have new terms of engagement with 'power'... The chains are gone... we just haven't been discussing it so the word hasn't been passed on...)

["151004zapatistamartialarts.mp3":]

...and this article shows us a concrete example of the 'martial arts' practice we must design... confronting the hard questions... creating a practice that cannot be undermined by agents [and we've talked about why that is in previous shows but we're going to revisit and get a little clearer on that question of why it is that the practice we design cannot be undermined by agents... and we're going to be discussing in a minute how that has been their favorite tactic... Marx attributes this tactic to Louis Bonaparte...]:

Trekking back from the bathrooms [the author is in "Oventik, a Zapatista town that is having their annual Festival del los Caracoles, their Snail or Spiral Festival" ...], she [a teacher from Tuxtia, the capital of Chiapas, Mexico...] asks what people think of the Zapatistas. I reply that when I was younger, 6 or 10 years ago, everyone on the left talked about the Zapatistas, but it seems to be less in fashion now. "You know, I think everybody looks at movements in other countries for how they relate to your own. When the talk was about globalization [and isn't it interesting how 'the talk' is no longer about 'the world'... no longer about 'class struggle'... because remember our Good Three reminded us that the concept 'class struggle' is by definition... because 'power' is global... a *global* endeavor... but that got 'lost' along the way... so... these things just 'pass in and out of fashion'... Well... how is it that something as major as our existence as free humans becomes 'out of fashion'?... – P.S.], the Zapatistas offered a vision of an alternative. In the last year, the big fight is against police violence in the cities, violence against bla—"

And I am hushed as two lines of masked men and women march past us, a solemn procession.

"Who are they?" I whisper after they pass.

"The Clandestine Committee," they proceed through the crowd to the front of the stage. There is a speech. Despite the military concentration just down the road... the speaker doesn't talk about the glorious resistance of fighting, martyrs, or the brutality of the evil government. It's all about producing healthy and pure food, remembering that man and woman are equal, education of the children [recall in a recent show our comment that the front line assault from 'power' on us was being conducted... as Marx wrote... right under his nose... that it simply would not occur to him... to look for the 'power'-guys offensive on us... among child-rearing activists... changing the terms of engagement – that was *their* major 'changing the terms of engagement'... with us – but has that not been supremely effective for them?... this brainwashing technique called "get the parents to do the work for you..." and then 'power' doesn't have to worry about this problem of 'disobedience'... if you can get the parents to train the children to be obedient to authority... there you are... 'easy-peazy-lemon-squeezy' (love that film... *Attack the Block*...) they knocked us silly with that technique and we didn't even know... we didn't even notice – not by accident... our attention always gets diverted once we start seeing the truth... they bring out some pundits to get us chasing some illusory problem... 'Power' has arrived at the realization that the best way to control dissent is to give us the 'movement' to get involved in: "here... this is the safe one..." – you can tell the ones that 'power' didn't create that are challenging to 'power'... they're gone... Well we have to do better... now that we see what's going on... – P.S.], and resolving conflicts with each other....

["151004somethingnewforthechildren.mp3":]

[So the speaker from the Clandestine Committee isn't interested in talking about the 'glory' of fighting... the speaker wants to talk about life... about the glory of creating something new for the children – *that's* what we need to be focused on... that's what 'power' *doesn't* want us focused on...

...and the last piece of their focus was 'resolving conflicts with each other'... and that ties directly into our discussions of making what we do 'agent-proof'... – P.S.]

Then the music starts and the basketball court and beyond becomes a dance floor. The Zapatistas don't drink alcohol. This was a controversial decision that was pushed through by Zapatista women, partly because of alcohol's associations with violence and sexual assault. In this crowd of over a thousand, I see no conflicts all night, and I'm amazed at how giddy and ridiculous I feel without alcohol, how light I feel without having to fend off drunken guys. There are still hundreds of couples dancing when the last band wraps up at 3 AM.

In between dancing, people eat and drink coffee. Zapatistas are used to foreigners coming through, and they're comfortable and confident talking. The ones I spoke to had absolutely no interest in our demonstrations, our revolts, our publications. All they ask me is "And what food projects do you have? And what of the education of your children? They are not incredibly impressed by my replies.

I think about the difference between the Zapatistas and radical folks in the US. Radical rhetoric and imagery from anti-government folks usually focus on the glory of resistance and struggle, crowds in the street and cop cars on fire, as the important thing, the exciting thing.

In contrast, Zapatistas see the real work, the important thing, as growing their own food, raising their children, living together. They are willing to engage in armed struggle to defend this autonomy from a government they feel has no legitimacy, but that's not what they want to devote their energy toward.... Their autonomy is due both to their own unbending will, and international pressure that keeps the Mexican military from slaughtering them wholesale.

The Zapatistas are alive and well.

I can't copy them, as I am not, and can never be, tied to a piece of land in the way that they are. And I wouldn't want to, as I'm lazy and the thought of being so enmeshed with my extended family makes me nauseous.... (Wolverine de Cleyre, "Alive and Well: A Visit to Zapatista Territory", *Slingshot*, Fall, 2015)

The challenge we face is not lack of courage but lack of certainty. Certainty is what we get when we recover the 'self' that is authentic... which is why Alice – her deepest argument that child-rearing under 'class' is totalitarian – is suppressed... and why it's important we incorporate her into our discussions... into our new education that we design for each other.

The guidance just received from our Sister and Brother Zapatistas... via Wolverine (and props to Wolverine... for capturing – consciously and otherwise – all the most relevant issues so succinctly...) Zapatista guidance would be to include in our practice: self-sufficiency provision... education redesign... reclaiming our bodies... not relinquishing our children... securing international support and co-planning...

...i.e.... they model our path forward (and allow us to understand why such mobilizations as the Black Panthers... MOVE... and the Occupy Movement had – from the perspective of 'power' – to be destroyed.)

But what of Wolverine's last point... that she is a traveler... that she wants no constraints on her? That must be incorporated too. That is our future: no coercion.

---

["151004decembertensociety1.mp3":]

[Today's reading: continuing our interlude: Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire*... before returning to the chapter "Poisonous Pedagogy" in Alice Miller's *For Your Own Good*...]

[We are reading excerpts from Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire*... and Immanuel Wallerstein's *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*, in order to see the origins of the 'modern' bureaucratic nation-state in the fixed determination of 'statesmen' to repress us... we-the-people... It is a new invention (we might even call it an 'intervention'...) and as long as it sits on us... we cannot grow into our infinite expansiveness.

Today Marx shows us a 'power'-tactic that... once grasped... they never let go of. He gives Louis Bonaparte credit for its invention. (I don't know if that's been confirmed since then...) Last week we introduced it with these words: The shadow-state needs shadow-troops... with shadow-orders... that they execute... When 'power' wants to operate 'extra-legally'... they convene impromptu 'December 10' societies. Earlier in the book Marx describes the Society of December 10 in this way... – P.S.]:

This society dates from the year 1849. [And let's not forget... from our 'Good Three's analysis... that 1848 was the first *world* revolution... We'll delve more into this when we read our excerpt from Wallerstein's most recent... – P.S.] On the pretext of founding a benevolent society, the *lumpenproletariat* [an ugly word... Marx's unfortunate use of which fits with his utilitarianism... – P.S.] of Paris had been organized into secret sections, each section being led by Bonapartist agents, with a Bonapartist general at the head of the whole. Alongside decayed *roues* with dubious means of subsistence and of dubious origin, alongside ruined and adventurous offshoots of the bourgeoisie, were vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, mountebanks, *lazzaroni*, pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, *maquereaus* [procurers], brothel keepers, porters, *literati*, organ-grinders, ragpickers, knife grinders, tinkers, beggars – in

short, the whole indefinite, disintegrated mass, thrown hither and thither, which the French term *la boheme*; from this kindred element Bonaparte formed the core of the Society of December 10. [They don't fit neatly into the notion of 'class' do they?... but they had to impose that on us... We'll get back to that whole question... of why did we have that ideology imposed on us... – P.S.] A “benevolent society” – in so far as, like Bonaparte, all its members felt the need of benefitting themselves at the expense of the labouring nation. This Bonaparte, who constitutes himself *chief of the lumpenproletariat*, who here alone rediscovers in mass form the interests which he personally pursues, who recognizes in this scum, offal, refuse of all classes the only class upon which he can base himself unconditionally, is the real Bonaparte, the Bonaparte *sans phrases* [“without the BS...” – P.S.]. An old crafty *roue*, he conceives the historical life of the nations and their performances of state as comedy in the most vulgar sense, as a masquerade where the grand costumes, words and postures merely serve to make the pettiest knavery.... In his Society of December 10, he assembles ten thousand rascally fellows, who are to play the part of the people, as Nick Bottom that of the lion. At a moment when the bourgeoisie itself played the most complete comedy, but in the most serious manner in the world, without infringing any of the pedantic conditions of French dramatic etiquette, and was itself half deceived, half convinced of the solemnity of its own performance of state, the adventurer, who took the comedy as plain comedy, was bound to win. [And that's an astute observation about 'power': those folks... in our case ten thousand global-guys... who take the comedy as comedy are bound to win over those (we-the-people) who are not able to wrestle with the real conditions that are determining things... – P.S.]

[“151004decembertensociety2.mp3”:]

[Take this drama to the world stage and you have hidden-'power' today – just think 'ISIS' and drug cartels... 'Boko Haram' and infiltrators-of-police-forces (how easy is it to create havoc... you just stick your agents in there... and you immediately create the opinions that you want... manipulate people in the direction that you want... Aren't we tired of this?... this endless manipulation of us?... Are we not ready to create authentic... honest... lives... and a world that is what it appears to be... so that our children can grow up in it honestly?... ) agent provocateurs of all sorts... etc.... – or in my micro-micro situation: students and the 'low-income'... immigrants and formerly-incarcerated (they've accumulated a whole bunch of folk... and if they've done that here... they've done that other places as well... So they have utilized this tactic ... this 'Society of December 10' tactic... it has to be a global tactic – I'm curious if others have noticed this tactic utilized around the world... See... this is why we need to organize a One-Day-Global-General-Strike'... not just to organize a One-Day-Global General Strike... but to begin a process of sharing knowledge and information about the tactics 'power' uses... so that we can share knowledge and information about the successful ways to confront those tactics... you know?... I have never heard discussed this tactic... and yet it is clearly one that they have used over and over with great success...) So... they throw in a whole bunch of folk: including their 'trainees' – the 'students' they're snowing... and by 'their students' I mean their 'Plato-lovin'-proto-fascist' duped-and-snowed children... and some... I imagine... older 'Tribesmen'... Plato's Tribesmen-sympathizers eager for action... for the human-weaponry Marx names... – plotting and planning behind scenes (they live to scheme – it's the only way they can feel smarter than everyone else... and they definitely need to feel smarter than everyone else...) while keeping us... not just ignorant of their actions – that goes without saying – but... as Marx says... ignorant of the play... ignorant that there *is* a play going on... oblivious that we are the puppets... while the hidden 'adventurers' as Marx termed them – and is that not a good word to use... to describe Plato's Tribe?... out to deceive the world while designing the global-stage as a House of Horrors – hand us sentences drenched in blood... our own... and the blood of our Brothers and Sisters... – P.S.]

...Only when he has eliminated his solemn opponent, when he himself now takes his imperial role seriously and under the Napoleonic mask imagines he is the real Napoleon, does he become the victim of his own conceptions of the world, the serious buffoon who no longer takes world history for a comedy but his comedy for world history....

[It may be... it's worth our consideration certainly... that Marx has alighted here... unwittingly (as he could not see the aftermath... as we have...) at a moment of initiation – of the almost-but-one first generation Plato's Tribesmen... first fruit if not First Cause – of the plan to re-invent and realize... Plato's Vision and Handbook... Because ... it seems to me... this is not buffoonery... but 'hidden-power' cracking its knuckles... experimenting... and readying itself... for 'play' on a larger stage...

[“151004preparationforlaunch.mp3”:]

...it also may be helpful to quickly glance... at the broader context that time (and Immanuel Wallerstein's analysis...) has enhanced... in anticipation of our further look... into Immanuel's book:

“The tide – that is, the European revolution of 1848 – as all such great happenings, was made up of a mixture of movements and objectives. In France, it consisted essentially of the joining together of Europe's 'first great proletarian insurrection' (Tilly, 1971, 228) with the acute discontent of the left liberals who shared John Stuart Mill's view of the conservatization of the July Monarchy....

“...The uprising of February 1848 illuminated the hopes of a 'social republic,' a vague socialist utopia that would provide jobs to the unemployed and liberation to all those who suffered indignities and inequalities. Everyone put forward their claims: the 'artisans'... the peasants... the women... the slaves... (p. 89)

“...The liberals acted in 1848 just as they had in 1830. Dismayed by a regime that had become too rigid, too illiberal, they rose up and quickly won the day. Then, dismayed by the possibility that the lower strata would be able to take advantage of the situation and push things too far [and this illustrates... again... that... to win our freedom... we have to trust our Brothers and Sisters (and... nullify the effect of agents...) have faith that all of us want the same things... ultimately: we want to be big... we want to grow our gifts... and we need to trust that in each other... – P.S.], they renewed their links with the political groups they had just ousted from power, because 'the enemy, at present, is on the left' (Palmade, 1961, 255). When Louis Napoleon made his *coup d'etat* on December 2, 1851, the primary objective was to repress the left. The secondary objective was, however, to constrain the ability of conservative forces to act other than through him. One can, if one wants, emphasize the Caesarist – the so-called Bonapartist – element in the regime. If one does, however, one risks missing the degree to which the outcome of the repression, which was both real and effective, was that of a centrist regime, oriented to capitalist expansion, constructing a liberal compromise – one led not by a classical liberal but by an enlightened conservative.” (Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*, p. 91 – 2)

If... as is the argument here... 'power' has gone shadow... to pursue a vision on the down-low... views accumulation as means (as Hirschman has helped us to see...) to realize this dream... then Napoleon the Nephew may be helping to launch that vessel... Continuing with *The Eighteenth Brumaire*... What follows should sound familiar to us... I thought of George Bush (the Lesser)'s (first) run for President... – P.S.]

What the national *ateliers* were for the socialist workers, what the *Gardes mobile* were for the bourgeois republicans, the Society of December 10 was for Bonaparte, the party fighting force peculiar to him. On his journeys the detachments of this society packing the railways had to improvise a public for him, stage public enthusiasm, roar *vive l'Empereur*, insult and thrash republicans, of course, under the protection of the police. On his return journeys to Paris they had to form the advance guard, forestall counter-demonstrations or disperse them. [This is what we see in every mobilization on the Left that has any ability to challenge 'power' to any degree: they mobilize the counter-demonstrations... they make sure they infiltrate our demonstrations with folks who claim they need this ability to smash windows because... 'whatever-whatever'... some peculiar rationale that no one believes... but which the media then makes sure gets distributed *ad infinitum*... and make sure that becomes the last image folks have of what happened... and that any kind of righteous cause gets suppressed... is never discussed... – P.S.] The Society of December 10 belonged to him, it was *his* work, his very own idea. Whatever else he appropriates is put into his hands by the force of circumstances; whatever else he does, the circumstance do for him or he is content to copy from the deeds of others. But Bonaparte with official phrases about order, religion, family and property in public, before the citizens, and with the secret society of the Schufferles and Spiegelbergs [a note at the back reads: “characters in Schiller's drama *Die Rauber* (The Robbers), who plunder and murder unimpeded by any moral scruples...”], the society of disorder, prostitution and theft, behind him – that is Bonaparte himself as original author, and the history of the Society of December 10 is his own history....

[This cannot be the first use of this tactic... is it Machiavellian?... the 'Bonaparte's are Italian... – P.S.]

...Now it happened by way of exception that people's representatives belonging to the party of Order came under the cudgels of the Decembrists. Still more, Yon, the Police Commissioner assigned to the National Assembly and charged with watching over its safety, acting on the deposition of a certain Alais, advised the Permanent Commission that a section of the Decembrists had decided to assassinate General Changarnier and Dupin, the President of the National Assembly, and had already designated the individuals who were to perpetuate the deed.... One comprehends the terror of M. Dupin. A parliamentary enquiry into the Society of December 10, that is, the profanation of the Bonapartist secret world, seemed inevitable. Just before the meeting of the National Assembly Bonaparte providently disbanded his society, naturally only on paper, for in a detailed manner at the end of 1851 Police Prefect Carrier still sought in vain to move him to really break up the Decembrists.

The Society of December 10 was to remain the private army of Bonaparte until he succeeded in transforming the public army into a Society of December 10. Bonaparte made the first attempt at this shortly after the adjournment of the National Assembly, and precisely with the money just wrested from it. As a fatalist, he lives in the conviction that there are certain higher powers which man, and the soldier in particular, cannot withstand. Among these powers he counts, first and foremost, cigars and champagne, cold poultry and garlic sausage. Accordingly, to begin with, he treats officers and non-commissioned officers in his Elysee apartments to cigars and champagne, to cold poultry and garlic sausage. On October 3 he repeats this manoeuvre with the mass of the troops at the St. Maur review, and on October 10 the same manoeuvre on a still larger scale at the Satory army parade. The Uncle remembered the campaigns of Alexander in Asia, the Nephew the triumphal marches of Bacchus in the same land. Alexander was a demigod, to be sure, but Bacchus was a god and moreover the tutelary deity of the Society of December 10.

[October 4, 2015 show ends here.]

After the review of October 3, the Permanent Commission summoned War Minister d'Hautpoul. He promised that these breaches of discipline should not recur. We know how on October 10 Bonaparte kept d'Hautpoul's word. As Commander-in-Chief of the Paris army, Changarnier had commanded at both reviews. He, at once a member of the Permanent Commission, chief of the National Guard, the "saviour" of January 29 and June 13, the "bulwark of society," the candidate of the party of Order for presidential honours, the suspected Monk of two monarchies, had hitherto never acknowledged himself as the subordinate of the War Minister, had always openly derided the republican Constitution and had pursued Bonaparte with an ambiguous lordly protection. Now he was consumed with zeal for discipline against the War Minister and for the Constitution against Bonaparte. While on October 10 a section of the calvary raised the shout: "*Vive Napoleon! Vivent les saucissons!*" ["Hurrah for Napoleon! Hurrah for the sausages!"] Changarnier arranged that at least the infantry marching past under the command of his friend Neumayer should preserve an icy silence. As a punishment, the War Minister relieved General Neumayer of his post in Paris at Bonaparte's instigation, on the pretext of appointing him commanding general of the fourteenth and fifteenth military divisions. Neumayer refused this exchange of posts and so had to resign. Changarnier, for his part, published an order of the day on November 2, in which he forbade the troops to indulge in political outcries or demonstrations of any kind while under arms. The Elysee newspapers attacked Changarnier; the papers of the party of Order attacked Bonaparte; the Permanent Commission held repeated secret sessions in which it was repeatedly proposed to declare the country in danger; the army seemed divided into two hostile camps, with two hostile general staffs, one in the Elysee, where Bonaparte resided, the other in the Tuileries, the quarters of Changarnier. It seemed that only the meeting of the National Assembly was needed to give the signal for battle. The French public judged this friction between Bonaparte and Changarnier like that English journalist who characterized it in the following words:

"The political housemaids of France are sweeping away the glowing lava of the revolution with old brooms and wrangle with one another while they do their work."

Meanwhile, Bonaparte hastened to remove the War Minister, d'Hautpoul, to pack him off in all haste to Algiers and to appoint General Schramm War Minister in his place. On November 12, he sent to the National Assembly a message of American prolixity ['prolix': "(of speech or writing)... using or containing too many words; tediously lengthy... – P.S.], overloaded with detail, redolent of order, desirous of reconciliation, constitutionally acquiescent, treating of all and sundry but not of the *questions brulantes* [burning questions] of the moment. As if in passing he made the remark that according to the express provisions of the Constitution the President alone could dispense of the army. The message closed with the following words of great solemnity:

"Above all things, France demands tranquility... But bound by an oath, I shall keep within the narrow limits that it has set for me... As far as I am concerned... elected by the people and owing my power to it alone, I shall always bow to its lawfully expressed will. Should you resolve at this session on a revision of the Constitution, a Constituent Assembly will regulate the position of the executive power. If not, then the people will solemnly pronounce its decision in 1852. But whatever the solutions of the future may be, let us come to an understanding, so that passion, surprise or violence may never decide the destiny of a great nation... What occupies my attention, above all, is not who will rule France in 1852, but how to employ the time which remains at my disposal so that the intervening period may pass by without agitation or disturbance. I have opened my heart to you with sincerity; you will answer by frankness with your trust, my good endeavours with your cooperation, and God will do the rest."

The respectable, hypocritically moderate, virtuously commonplace language of the bourgeoisie reveals its deepest meaning in the mouth of the autocrat of the Society of December 10 and the picnic hero of St. Maur and Satory.



The burgraves of the party of Order did not delude themselves for a moment concerning the trust that this opening of the heart deserved. About oaths they had long been *blasé*; they numbered in their midst veterans and virtuosos of political perjury. Nor had they failed to hear the passage about the army. They observed with annoyance that in its discursive enumeration of lately enacted laws the message passed over the most important law, the elector law, in studied silence, and, moreover, in the event of there being no revision of the Constitution, left the election of the President in 1852 to the people. The electoral law was the leaden ball chained to the feet of the party of Order, which prevented it from walking and so much the more from storming forward! Moreover, by the official disbandment of the Society of December 10 and the dismissal of the War Minister d'Hautpoul, Bonaparte had with his own hand sacrificed the scapegoats on the altar of the country. He had blunted the edge of the expected collision. Finally, the party of Order itself anxiously sought to avoid, to mitigate, to gloss over any decisive conflict with the executive power. For fear of losing their conquests over the revolution, they allowed their rival to carry off the fruits thereof. "Above all things, France demands tranquillity." This was what the party of Order had cried to the revolution since February [1848], this was what Bonaparte's message cried to the party of Order. "Above all things, France demands tranquillity." ["The people will choose totalitarianism over chaos..." we are told Plato said... – P.S.] Bonaparte committed acts that aimed at usurpation, but the party of Order committed "unrest" if it raised a row about these acts and construed them hypochondriacally. The sauses of Satory were quiet as mice when no one spoke of them. "Above all things, France demands tranquillity." Bonaparte demanded, therefore, that he be left in peace to do as he liked and the parliamentary party was paralyzed by a double fear, by the fear of again evoking revolutionary unrest and by the fear of itself appearing as the instigator of unrest in the eyes of its own class, in the eyes of the bourgeoisie.... (p. 75 – 81)

[I think we have a sense now of the Society of December 10... Before returning to the conclusion of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*... and from there to Alice... let's step back and view events from the perspective of the 'world-system'... In the September 13, 2015 show...we asked about the word 'class'... sought the origins of its current use... used as an ideological weapon of the 'global-state-statesmen' against we-the-people... and as an ideological tool to indoctrinate their children... Since then I've found Immanuel Wallerstein's answer... in his 2011 book... *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*... which is very relevant to this discussion... and in particular the chapter... "The Liberal State and Class Conflict, 1830 – 1875"... which... as I write this (on September 19, 2015) I'm strongly considering that we read together (although to interject yet another interjection at this point might seem unwieldy... but... I'm thinkin' on it... Here's how that chapter starts... – P.S.):

"The Liberal State and Class Conflict, 1830 – 1875", Chapter 3 in Immanuel Wallerstein's *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*... (page 77 – 141)

During the first half of the nineteenth century, socialism as a concept was still not separate from "bourgeois democracy" as a concept or, as Labrousse (1949b, 7) says, "Jacobinism and socialism remained muddled in political life." In some sense, it probably remained for at least a century thereafter that a full distinction of the two concepts did not exist. Nonetheless, liberalism (which seems to me a better locution than "bourgeois democracy") and socialism began to have diverging trajectories as political options after 1830. Indeed, as Hobsbawm (1962, 284) argues:

Practical liberals... shied away from political democracy... The social discontents, revolutionary movements, and the socialist ideologues of the post-Napoleonic era intensified this dilemma [of relying upon the majority to carry out the dictates of reason] and the 1830 Revolution made it acute. Liberalism and democracy appeared to be adversaries rather than allies.

[The following quote from the opening chapter (p. 5 - 6) of this book by Wallerstein should help clarify how he is using the term 'liberal' and 'liberalism':

"Liberalism started ideological life on the left of the political spectrum, or at least on the center-left. [From the little I've digested thus far from this book by Wallerstein... he uses 'liberals' as I use 'Plato's Tribesmen'... the 'power'-guys... post-French Revolution... We shall have to consider whether that comparison is accurate as we go along... but if there is any correspondence at all... to apply the term 'left' to these guys... in any sense of the word... from where I sit... invalidates it... – P.S.] Liberalism defined itself as the opposite of conservatism, on the basis of what might be called a "consciousness of being modern" (Minogue, 1963, 3). Liberalism proclaimed itself universalist. Sure of themselves and of the truth of this new world-view of modernity, liberals sought to propagate their views and intrude the logic of their views within all social institutions, thereby ridding the world of the "irrational" leftovers of

the past. To do this, they had to fight conservative ideologues, whom they saw as obsessed with fear of “free men” – men liberated from the false idols of tradition.

“Liberals believed, however, that progress, even though it was inevitable, could not be achieved without some human effort, without a political program. Liberal ideology was thus the belief that, in order for history to follow its natural course, it was necessary to engage in conscious, continual, intelligent reformism, in full awareness that “time was the universal friend, which would inevitably bring greater happiness to ever greater numbers” (Schapiro, 1949, 13). [Straight-up Bentham... of course... who at least was honest... but these guys can absolutely not be taken at their word – not these guys... with their 'lordly lies' and their training as infants to keep secrets. Secrecy is their watchword... hiding their m.o.... public presentation necessarily the dissemination of propaganda... – P.S.]

“...To be sure, the center is merely an abstraction, and a rhetorical device. One can always locate oneself in central position simply by defining the extremes as one wishes. Liberals are those who decided to do this as their basic political strategy. Faced with the normality of change, liberals would claim a position between the conservatives – that is, the right, who wanted to slow down the pace of normal change as much as possible – and the “democrats” (or radicals or socialists or revolutionaries) – that is, the left, who wanted to speed it up as much as possible. In short, liberals were those who wished to control the pace of change so that it occurred at what they considered to be an optimal speed. But could one really know what is the optimal speed? Yes, said the liberals, and their metastrategy was precisely geared to achieving this end.” (p. 5 - 6)

[What I want to know is... what happened to the language 'world bourgeoisie'... 'world elite'... 'world right'... the “managers of the status quo...” of *Antisystemic Movements* – true... he uses 'world right' in his chapter of *Does Capitalism Have A Future?*... which is more straight-forward... and states their totalitarian ambition more baldly... perhaps we will discover the answer in the course of our reading...

[Returning to Chapter 3... “The Liberal State and Class Conflict, 1830 – 1875”... – P.S.]:

The concept of class and class conflict was not a contribution of socialist ideologues, much less of Karl Marx. It is a Saint-Simonian idea, developed and pursued by Guizot as part of the liberal project. Saint-Simon's view of the class structure in the modern industrial world was that there were *three* classes: the property owners, the propertyless, and the savants [It seems to me a clear debt here to Plato... – P.S.]. He saw the class conflict between the “industrials” (those who work) and the idlers as a transitional phase, to be superseded by a harmonious society [...and another debt here... to Bentham... as well as to Plato... – P.S.] of productive industrial classes under the aegis of the savants [...the 'philosopher-kings'... – P.S.], a meritocratic vision in which the old aristocracy of birth would be replaced by an aristocracy of talent (Manuel, 1956; Iggers, 1958b). For Guizot, the concept of class was an essential element in his efforts to “legitimate the political aspirations of the bourgeoisie” (Fossert, 1955, 60).

But in 1830, Guizot and his friends succeeded, as they were simultaneously succeeding in Great Britain, in establishing a form of middle-class rule “as a permanent *juste milieu* or golden mean between the extremes of revolution and reaction” (Starzinger, 1965, viii). The Chamber of Deputies on August 7, 1830, suppressed the Preamble to the Charter of 1814 “as wounding the national dignity by appearing to *grant* to Frenchmen rights which belong to them essentially” (Collins, 1970, 90). The liberals politically and the *grande bourgeoisie* socially had at last won their *droit de cite*. [Wallerstein's note (partially) reads: “Both L'homme (1960, 36) and Pouthas (1962, 258) speak of the substitution of one class for the other as the dominant force...”]

Since, in addition, this coincided with a period of accelerating economic and social change, the most urgent problems facing France and Great Britain had now become the “social problems” of industrialism, and especially those of the “new proletariat, the horrors of uncontrolled break-neck urbanization” (Hobsbawm, 1962, 207). Class conflict would therefore come to mean something different from what Saint-Simon and Guizot had had in mind. The Revolution of 1830 itself came at a moment of particular economic difficulty for the workers (high unemployment, unusually high wheat prices). It provided evidence of the utility of political uprising and served to stimulate workers' consciousness, a sense of having common interest “solely as proletarians,” a sense of the “dignity of the worker” (Festy, 1908, 330). The liberals perceived this change immediately. Thiers said in a statement to the Chamber of Deputies: “The day after the Revolution of July, we saw our duty to moderate it. In effect it was no longer liberty, but order which was in danger” (cited in Bezucha, 1974, 137).

The next few years were to see worker unrest of a new intensity and quality in both France and Great Britain. It has been increasingly noted in the literature on strikes and workers' unrest how much of this activity was that of "artisans" as opposed to "workers." Although the line is not always as clear as some seem to think, in general those referred to as "artisans" had more technical skills, higher real income, and more workplace autonomy than other kinds of workers. Many of these "artisans" were members of organizations that had been in existence long before the nineteenth century, and which functioned to advance the welfare of their members through social support and mutual help. The organizations were hierarchical and built around rituals.

These organizations were the only ones permitted at all in the periods when trade-union organization had been strictly forbidden, and then only under the careful surveillance of the authorities. In the changing political situation after 1830, however, even mutual aid societies began to take on new roles, as See (1951, 2:199) pointed out: "Many of these societies served... to hide veritable *resistance organizations*, hostile to the employers; by creating *auxiliary monetary reserves (bourses auxiliaires)*, they created funds to support the unemployed and strikers." Thus it could be, as Stearns (1965, 371 – 372) has argued, that such "artisans" were more likely to engage in strike action at this time than the "factory workers," who, being in an even weaker position, were "almost totally quiescent." [While Wallerstein – in his use of quotation marks with the 'class' designations – acknowledges the fluidity of the categories into which we are put... for ease of analysis in Academe... and to facilitate 'power's planning... The critique in this space goes further. You recall during the September 27, 2015 show... my comment that 'class' categorizations have no valid use for us... exist... rather... to serve 'power's ideological purposes... – P.S.]

The distinction made by many scholars between artisans and factory workers seems to be asserted primarily on the basis of differing workplace organization. But in fact the artisans were usually in "workshops," which were not all that different in structure and even social organization from the rather small "factories" that existed in this era. I suspect the real difference was in the social origins of the two groups of workers. The "artisans" were males, and males who came for the most part from the immediate area. The "factory workers" were largely either women and children (Bezucha, 1974, 35) or "migrants," which included both those who came from rural communities and workers speaking another language.

The most dramatic expression of protest by the "artisans" was that of the *canuts* of Lyon, first in 1831 and then in 1834. The struggles began right after the July Revolution, and included machine destruction and eviction of "foreign" workers. The background to this was an eighteenth-century militancy of journeymen, which had erupted in 1786 in the so-called tuppenny riot (*emeute de deux sous*), in which the journeymen sought to obtain a fixed minimum rate for finished cloth. The ongoing turmoil continued up to the French Revolution and the enactment of the *Loi Le Chapelier*. Bezucha (1974, 46) concludes that "the French Revolution, in fact, broke the momentum created prior to 1789 and may have retarded the development of a workers' movement in Lyon." In the years between 1789 and 1830, however, the relatively stable system of the *compagnon* had been replaced by a more "fluid one of piece-work laborers" (Bezucha, 1974, 46)

Levasseur (1904, 2:6) asks the questions, Why Lyon? Why 1831? His answer is that Lyon was living off a luxury industry, silk, which made it more "sensitive... to economic crises and political turmoil." The immediate issue, as in 1786, was a minimum wage, which had been agreed to by the prefect but subsequently revoked by the central government. The first strike was relatively nonpolitical. But discontent continued. There was a strike in Paris in 1832. The atmosphere was more and more politicized, partly by the dissatisfaction of the working classes with the politics of the July Monarchy, partly (at least in Lyon) by the agitation of the Italian nationalist forces. Mazzini's aide-de-camp, General Romorino, was often in Lyon recruiting persons for their attempts to liberate Savoy and Piedmont (Bezucha, 1974, 122). On February 14, 1834, a general strike was called. It did not succeed. The local Republican party was divided in its attitude. A repressive law caused a further reaction by the workers in April, an uprising in which some three hundred were killed. This attempt came to be viewed as a "landmark in the history of the European working class" (Bezucha, 1974, 124). This time the repression by the authorities was definitive. There was a "monster trial" in 1835, which the government used "to get rid of the republicans." Faced with the beginnings of a serious class struggle by the urban working class, the liberal state initially reacted as repressively as did its predecessors.

The story was not very different in Great Britain. The moral equivalent of the July Revolution was the Reform Bill of 1832. Great Britain did not know "three glorious days" of "revolution." Instead, there was a parliamentary battle in which the revolution was "voted" in, on the crucial second reading in 1831, by a single vote.

When, despite this, the bill was defeated in committee. Parliament was dissolved, and a pro-reform Parliament elected. At the time there was great awareness of events in France, and the possibilities of "worse" happening. Macaulay's speech on March 2, 1831, in favor of reform makes clear the reasoning of those who advocated it:

Turn where we may, within, around, the voice of great events is proclaiming to us, Reform, that you may preserve... Renew the youth of the State. Save property divided against itself. Save the multitude, endangered by its own ungovernable passions. Save the aristocracy, endangered by its own unpopular power. Save the greatest, and fairest, and most highly civilised country that ever existed, from calamities that may in a few days sweep away all the rich heritage of so many ages of wisdom and glory. The danger is terrible. The time is short. If this Bill should be rejected, I pray to God that none of those who concur in rejecting it ever remember their votes with unavailing remorse, amidst the wreck of laws, the confusion of ranks, the spoliation of property, and the dissolution of social orders.

Macaulay's argument was heard. And, exactly as in France, once the middle strata had won their *droit de cite*, attention turned immediately to containing the claims of the working classes. Chartism, "much the most important movement of working men" (Evans, 1983, 215) and a continuation of the old radical reform movement, was contemporaneous with and strongest during the great industrial depression from 1837 to 1843. It gained considerable notoriety and seemed a real menace to the authorities for several years. A large part of Chartist ranks were drawn from members of trade societies. But it also had support from middle-class radicals (Rowe, 1967, 85). The Chartist movement existed simultaneously with, and was in direct rivalry with, the free-trade movement of the Anti-Corn Law League. Halevy (1947, 9) raises the specter of a potential for "civil war." Briggs (1959, 312) speaks of the two movements as representing "a contrast between two segments of a divided society." Gash (1965, 2) says of the "Movement" ("a phrase borrowed from Continental politics") that it "had an undeniable air of class war...."

...The internal problems of Great Britain and France never became large enough that those powers could not concentrate attention on the geopolitics of the world-system. The July Revolution, repeated and confirmed by the independence of Belgium and the Reform Act of 1832, was to have an immediate effect on Europe. Whereas the relations of Great Britain and France between 1815 and 1830 had been correct, and those countries often found themselves on similar sides of world issues, the heritage of the two-century struggle for hegemony continued to ensure enough mutual suspicion to preserve a degree of distance. The July Revolution overcame that, affecting even the Tory government of Wellington before the Reform Bill was enacted. Europe now entered the era of the *entente cordiale*, a marriage perhaps not of love but certainly of reason, one that would survive all subsequent quarrels until at least 1945. The term itself was probably coined by Palmerston in 1831, although it did not come into official use until 1842 (Guyot, 1926, 220; Halevy, 1950, 3:73, n. 1). The geopolitical basis of the alliance was clear, "As a Liberal power, France was [after the July Revolution] in the nature of things the ally of Liberal England" (Halevy, 1950, 3:73). Great Britain could now pursue with greater ease its containment of absolutism in Europe and expand the circle of liberal states (Guyot, 1926, 88, 117)

But there were further motives. Great Britain and France faced the same internal problems, and even if France was not yet ready to embrace the free-trade nostrums of Great Britain, the *entente cordiale* seemed "in the eyes of democrats and socialists" as an "alliance of capitals" that was a "*fait accompli*" (Guyot, 1926, 302). Was this so wrong? Indeed, the two effects were not separate. In pressuring other powers to follow their example, Great Britain and France, with the *entente cordiale*, "discouraged the international revolutionary propaganda which counted on the divisions among the powers" (Guichen, 1917, 424 – 425).

Furthermore, 1830 launched a pattern that would discourage such propaganda even further. For France at least, 1830 served to restore France to a sense of world centrality and nationalist pride. It was not Guizot but the French socialist Louis Blanc (1844, 4:143 – 144) who would write:

The July Revolution... was more than the *denouement* of a struggle against the Church and royalty; it was the expression of national sentiment that had been excessively repressed by the treaties of 1815. We were determined to shake off the yoke of these treaties and restore the European equilibrium.

One of the curious facts to note about the July Revolution was what happened in Algeria. Charles X's launching of the imperial venture had made Great Britain most unhappy, and Louis XVIII was ready to sacrifice it to appease the British. When, however, the French restrained themselves from direct intervention in Belgium, they felt they had done their share of pleasing the British, and simply continued the occupation, this time without British protest. One reason clearly was its effect on worker unrest within France. The "floating" population of Paris, the potential revolutionaries, were being encouraged to settle in Algeria. Indeed, in 1838 Leon Blondel, a high civil servant in Algeria, could say with some confidence: "Africa is an element of order in France" (cited in Tudesq, 1964, 2:815).

The liberal states thus combined legitimating the political role of the middle classes (and thereby receiving from them legitimation in turn) and internal repression of working-class discontent with an entente cordiale between themselves to ensure their dominance in the geopolitical arena. This seemed to work at first. But it was fragile, as the European revolution of 1848 was to demonstrate. More would have to be done to secure a stable political framework for the capitalist world-economy in the post-1789 situation. [And... again... as Hirschman suggests... a lot of megalomaniacal scheming can be hidden 'neath the ideology of 'an economy' that never stops eating... because of some supposed 'inherent logic of accumulation'... – P.S.]

...The conservatization of the French regime contrasted with what was happening in the other liberal states. A liberal pope, Pius IX, had been elected in 1846, to the dismay of Metternich (Bury, 1948, 425). If Belgium remained “calm” in 1848, “it was because it had made its revolution, peacefully, in 1847. (Dhondt, 1949, 124) Similarly, the liberals and radicals had won their internal struggle against the Sonderbund in Switzerland in 1847, with the diplomatic support of the British but amid French hesitation (Halperin, 1948, 1:157). Indeed, this was a moment of temporary breakdown of the entente cordiale. At home, the British had handled well the chartist challenge at the same time that Sir Robert Peel was steering through the Repeal of the Corn Laws [“Materially the repeal of the Corn Laws would protect the poorer classes in time of scarcity against any disastrous rise in food prices. Morally, it gave them assurances that, unenfranchised though most of them were, their welfare was an object of concern to an aristocratic Government and Parliament” (Gash, 1977, 97)], such that the “specter of Communism” passed them by as well. The crisis of 1847 “provoked no revolutionary disturbance” (Halevy, 1947, 181), although the Irish had to pay the price for this [the Irish potato famine occurred just at the time of the debate on the Corn Laws... that the Irish famine became a ploy in the intra-Conservative political game is clear from Clark's account of repeal: “The traditional remedy for famine was to suspend the Corn Laws and open the ports. But Peel told his Cabinet that if he did this (in the case of Ireland at this time) he could not promise to reimpose them, and a majority in the Cabinet felt they could not support him in this policy on these terms. He therefore retired, but the Whigs could not, or would not, form a government. Peel therefore returned to office at the Queen's request (and repealed the Corn Laws himself.”)]

Nonetheless, the weakening of the liberal project in France, one of the two pillar states, provided enough tinder for the revolutionary flame to be ignited throughout the nonliberal [meaning “non-‘bourgeois’”] parts of Europe. To be sure, Metternich and the Austrians blamed the British, accused of being too liberal, for the uprisings, but the blame is more legitimately placed at the feet of the French, who got cold feet and were not liberal enough. John Stuart Mill (1849, 7) was very severe on Louis-Philippe in assessing the causes of the February 1848 uprising in Paris, which was the beginning of the 1848 European revolutions:

No government can now expect to be permanent unless it guarantees progress as well as order; nor can it continue really to secure order, unless it promotes progress. [It certainly seems the global-state-statesmen have taken this advice to heart... although modified to say: “*seem* to guarantee 'progress'...” that message is drummed into all school-children and every other 'class'-bound human... across the globe – an associated set of messages actually: “not everyone is smart...” “the system identifies and rewards the 'smart ones'...” “the 'really smart' are busy making our lives easier...” “the system works hard to provide you with 'the good life' but you must do your part too... and keep your skills marketable... because 'science' is developing so fast... if you don't you could fall through the cracks (and of course that would be *your* fault...”) – these are just a few of 'the system's key messages about 'progress'... – P.S.] It can go on as yet, with only a little of the spirit of improvement; while reformers have even a remote hope of effecting their objects through the existing system, they are generally willing to bear with it. But when there is no hope at all; when the institutions themselves seem to oppose an unyielding barrier to the program of improvement, the advance of tide heaps itself up behind them till it bears them down.

The tide – that is, the European revolution of 1848 – as all such great happenings, was made up of a mixture of movements and objectives. In France, it consisted essentially of the joining together of Europe's 'first great proletarian insurrection' (Tilly, 1971, 228) with the acute discontent of the left liberals who shared John Stuart Mill's view of the conservatization of the July Monarchy. Elsewhere in Europe, instates that were not as yet committed to liberalism, there were no proletarian insurrections; rather, there were liberal uprisings combined with nationalist uprisings. Two situations, with two solutions: Louis Napoleon handled the first; Palmerston, the rest.

The uprising of February 1848 illuminated the hopes of a 'social republic,' a vague socialist utopia that would provide jobs to the unemployed and liberation to all those who suffered indignities and inequalities. Everyone put forward their claims: the “artisans,” who sought to restore their privileges and their mode of production; the peasants, who sought to reestablish traditional rights of collective usage; the women, who sought the extension of “universal” suffrage to include them; the

slaves, who sought abolition. The pendulum was beginning to swing too far, and in June the forces of order under General Cavaignac reined in the unruly dangerous classes. "Pitiful provisional government!" cried Labrousse (1948,2) "It feared the social revolution as much as it did the counter-revolution."

Cavaignac could repress; he could not re-legitimize the state. Nor could the monarchs return; they had exhausted their credit. Into this void stepped Louis Napoleon, who sought to re-create a liberal, orderly, modern state and who, as Zeldin (1958, 6) puts it so well, "was not elected because he was [the] candidate [of the Party of Order], but... was their candidate because they saw he was bound to win." But what did Louis Napoleon represent? He represented, first of all, the Napoleonic tradition, which combined the legacy of the French Revolution, a commitment to scientific and industrial progress, and nationalism. During the 1840s, Louis Napoleon had been a sharp critic of the July Monarchy because he felt that, by distancing itself from progressive liberalism, it was "building on sand and would surely tumble." And, unlike Guizot, he was aware that "with proper safeguards a democratic regime could be established without threatening the stability of the country."

---

The liberals acted in 1848 just as they had in 1830. Dismayed by a regime that had become too rigid, too illiberal, they rose up and quickly won the day. Then, dismayed by the possibility that the lower strata would be able to take advantage of the situation and push things too far, they renewed their links with the political groups they had just ousted from power, because 'the enemy, at present, is on the left' (Palmade, 1961, 255). When Louis Napoleon made his coup d'etat on December 2, 1851, the primary objective was to repress the left. The secondary objective was, however, to constrain the ability of conservative forces to act other than through him. One can, if one wants, emphasize the Caesarist – the so-called Bonapartist – element in the regime. If one does, however, one risks missing the degree to which the outcome of the repression, which was both real and effective, was that of a centrist regime, oriented to capitalist expansion, constructing a liberal compromise – one led not by a classical liberal but by an enlightened conservative." (Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*, p. 77 – 92)

[Returning now to the conclusion of *The Eighteenth Brumaire...* – P.S.]

Bonaparte would like to appear as the patriarchal benefactor of all classes. But he cannot give to one class without taking from another. Just as at the time of the Fronde it was said of the Duke of Guise that he was the most *obligeant* man in France because he had turned all his estates into his partisans' obligations to him, so Bonaparte would fain be the most *obligeant* man in France and turn all the property, all the labour of France into a personal obligation to himself. He would like to steal the whole of France in order to be able to make a present of her to France or, rather, in order to be able to buy France anew with French money, for as the chief of the Society of December 10 he must needs buy what ought to belong to him. And all the state institutions, the Senate, the Council of State, the legislative body, the Legion of Honour, the soldiers' medals, the washhouses, the public works, the railways, the *etat major* [General Staff] of the National Guard to the exclusion of privates, and the confiscated estates of the House of Orleans – all become parts of the institution of purchase. Every place in the army and in the government machine becomes a means of purchase. But the most important feature of this process, whereby France is taken in order to give to her, is the percentages that find their way into the pockets of the head and the members of the Society of December 10 during the turnover. The witticism with which Countess L., the mistress of M. de Morny, characterized the confiscation of the Orleans estates: "*C'est le premier vol de l'aigle*" ["It is the first flight (theft) of the eagle"] is applicable to every flight of this *eagle*, which is more like a *raven* [I resent that! The raven is most regal... – P.S.]. He himself and his adherents call out to one another daily like that Italian Carthusian admonishing the miser who, with boastful display, counted up the goods on which he could yet live for years to come: "*Tu fai conto sopra i beni, bisogna prima far il conto sopra gli anni.*" ["Thou countest thy goods, thou shouldst first count thy years."] Lest they make a mistake in the years, they count the minutes. A bunch of blokes push their way forward to the court, into the ministries, to the head of the administration and the army, a crowd of the best of whom it must be said that no one knows whence he comes, a noisy, disreputable, rapacious bohème that crawls into gallooned coats with the same grotesque dignity as the high dignitaries of Soulouque. One can visualize clearly this upper stratum of the Society of December 10, if one reflects that *Veron-Crevel* [In his work, *Cousine Bette*, Balzac delineates the thoroughly dissolute Parisian philistine in Crevel, a character which he draws after the model of Dr. Veron, the proprietor of the *Constitutionnel* ('a French bourgeois daily')] is its preacher of morals and *Granier de Cassagnac* its thinker. When Guizot, at the time of his ministry, utilized this Granier on a hole-and-corner newspaper against the dynastic opposition, he used to boast of him with the quip: "*C'est le roi des droles*," "he is the king of buffoons." One would do wrong to recall the Regency or Louis XV in connection with Louis Bonaparte's court and clique. For "often already, France has experienced a government of *homme entretenus*" [kept men].

Driven by the contradictory demands of his situation and being at the same time, like a conjurer, under the necessity of keeping the public gaze fixed on himself, as Napoleon's substitute, by springing constant surprises, that is to say, under the necessity of executing a *coup d'état en miniature* every day, Bonaparte throws the entire bourgeois economy into confusion, violates everything that seemed inviolable to the Revolution of 1848, makes some tolerant of revolution, others desirous of revolution, and produces actual anarchy in the name of order, while at the same time stripping its halo from the entire state machine, profanes it and makes it at once loathsome and ridiculous. The cult of the Holy Tunic of Treves ["a Catholic relic preserved in the Treves Cathedral, alleged to be a holy vestment taken from Christ while he was suffering death. It was regarded by pilgrims as an object of veneration."] he duplicates at Paris in the cult of the Napoleonic imperial mantle. But when the imperial mantle finally falls on the shoulders of Louis Bonaparte, the bronze statue of Napoleon will crash from the top of the Vendome Column. (Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, p. 133 – 135)

[Because our – that is... we-the-people's – understanding of 'historical' events is generally through the lens of the 'educational system' of (premised on) 'class'... designed to reinforce the 'logic' of 'rule' (consciously or unconsciously...) which 'logic'... we are now seeing... is embedded in the utilitarian mindset... a.k.a. 'dualism'... on which 'thought' itself is premised – under 'class' – how do we 'make' authentic 'sense' of the blow-by-blow 'class'-sanctioned ('system'-stamped-legitimate) historical descriptions we are given?

What does this 'history' *mean*... for us?... what are we to make of it?

Let's return to this question after considering the broader world-systems context provided by Immanuel Wallerstein – this will be his view further into the same chapter (“The Liberal State and Class Conflict”) we've been excerpting. Two things stand out... one: “the supremacy game” the 'power'-guys are engaged in with each other... experimenting with their new toy... the 'powerful'... bureaucratic... nation-state – and two: their self-creation as 'global-state-statesmen'... with a common vision and purpose... inventing... as the key structural means for accomplishing this... an interstate 'mechanism' to ensure our – that is... we-the-people's – suppression... A question we should ask ourselves... I think... is... why... even in the analyses of those who have our interests in mind... these obvious motives of 'power' are not the starting point of these analyses... and why rather our advocates help legitimate these unmistakable motives by employing the ideology of 'economic development'? Wherever we stand on this issue... there needs to be discussion... – P.S.]:

The 1850s marked the high point of growth in British exports. The export of cotton piece goods “just about doubled” in the decade, actually increasing even the *rate* of growth, which, Hobsbawm argues (1975, 30 – 31), provided “invaluable [political] breathing-space.” Cotton textiles were still central to British wealth, but this was the period in which metals and machinery moved to the fore as the leading industry, and with them the emergence of “bigger industrial units all along the line” (Clapham, 1932, 2:114). Great Britain was clearly on the road to becoming an industrial state. “The course was set” (Clapham, 1932, 2:22). For Great Britain, these were “buoyant years,” in which her economic dominance of the world-economy went “virtually unchallenged” and in which the new world of industry “seemed less like a volcano and more like a cornucopia (Coleman, 1973, 7 – 8)... (Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*, p. 102 – 119)

... – P.S.]

[Returning to Alice... and skipping ahead...]

In the three scenes that follow, we see vivid examples of how the principles described above can be put into practice. I quote these passages at such length in order to give the reader an idea of the atmosphere these children (i.e., if not we ourselves, then at least our parents) breathed in daily. This material helps us to understand how neuroses develop. They are not caused by an external event but by repression of the innumerable psychological factors making up the child's daily life that the child is never capable of describing because he or she doesn't know that things can be any other way. [The totalitarian state – which is what we got today... must be systematically replaced... with new thoughts... – P.S.]

Until the time he was four, I taught little Konrad four essentials: to pay attention, to obey, to behave himself, and to be moderate in his desires.

The first I accomplished by continually showing him all kinds of animal, flowers, and other wonders of nature and by explaining pictures to him: the second by constantly making him, whenever he was in my presence, do things at my bidding; the third by inviting children to come play with him from time to time when I was present, and whenever a quarrel arose, I carefully determined who had started it and removed the culprit from the game for a time; the fourth I taught him by often

denying him something he asked for with great agitation. Once, for example, I cut up a honeycomb and brought a large dishful into the room. "Honey! Honey!" he cried joyfully. "Father, give me some honey," pulled his chair to the table, sat down, and waited for me to spread a few rolls with honey for him. I didn't do it but set the honey before him and said: "I'm not going to give you any honey yet; first we will plant some peas in the garden; then, when that is done, we will enjoy a roll with honey together." He looked first at me, then at the honey, whereupon he went to the garden with me. Also, when serving food, I always arranged it so that he was the last one served. For example, my parents and little Christel were eating with us once, and we had rice pudding, which he especially liked. "Pudding!" he cried joyfully, embracing his mother. "Yes," I said, "it's rice pudding. Little Konrad shall have some, too. First the big people shall have some, and afterwards the little people. Here, Grandmother, is some pudding for you. Here, Grandfather, is some for you, too! Here, Mother, is some for you. This is for Father, this for Christel, and this? Whom do you think this is for?" "Onrad," he responded joyfully. He did not find this arrangement unjust, and I saved myself all the vexation parents have who give their children the first portion of whatever is brought to the table. [Salzmann (1796), quoted in Rutschky]

The "little people" sit quietly at the table and wait. This need not be demeaning. It all depends on the adult's intention – and here the adult in question shows unabashedly how much he enjoys his power and his bigness at the expense of the little ones.

Something similar occurs in the next story, in which telling a lie is the only possible way for the child to read in privacy:

A lie is something dishonorable. It is recognized as such even by those who tell one, and there probably isn't a single liar who has any self-respect. But someone who doesn't respect himself doesn't respect others either, and the liar thus finds himself excluded from human society to a certain extent....